

REMARKS

A new set of claims (Claims 14- 31) is presented in view of the decision on appeal. It is believed that the new set of claims overcome the objections of the examiner and the Board. They are claiming different subject matter than what was before the Board and rejected by the examiner. They claim a processor and steps including a processor and therefore are claiming patentable subject matter. They are also deemed clear and definite.

The processor and the method are not taught by the references. The processor as claimed in claim 14 for creating a reduced size encoded pronunciation dictionary from an input pronunciation dictionary such that the encoded pronunciation dictionary does not need to be expanded to a larger size in order to be utilized is not taught by the references. There is not taught the combination of a reading and sorting processor to read an input pronunciation dictionary and sort the words of the dictionary in alphabetical order; a word encoder that encodes each word of the pronunciation dictionary by comparing the word with the prior word encoded and either outputs the number of prefix characters that match both the word and the prior word beginning characters if the number of matching characters is greater than or equal to N followed by the suffix characters of the word after character N, or outputs all characters of the word if the number of prefix characters that match the word and prior encoded word is less than N; a text-to-pronunciation processor that operates on the word to be encoded to generate a pronunciation hypothesis; a pronunciation comparer that compares the pronunciation of each word by comparing the pronunciation of the word from the input pronunciation dictionary and the pronunciation hypothesis from the text-to-pronunciation processor and determines the minimum number of pronunciation differences consisting of substitutions, deletions and insertions that need to be corrected in the pronunciation hypothesis to convert it to match the pronunciation of the input pronunciation dictionary; and a pronunciation encoder that compares the pronunciation differences of the word to the pronunciation differences of the prior encoded word and either outputs the number of prefix differences that match the beginning of both the word differences and the prior word differences followed by the suffix differences of the word if the number of prefix matching differences is greater

than or equal to M, or outputs all differences to the word if the number of prefix differences that match the word and prior encoded word is less than N. Claim 14 is therefore deemed allowable over the references.


Claims 15-22 dependent on claim 14 are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14.

Similarly the method of claim 23 is not taught in the references. Claim 23 is therefore deemed allowable over the references.

Claims 24-31 dependent on claim 23 are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 23.

In view of the above applicant's claims 14-31 are deemed allowable and an early notice of allowance of these claims is deemed in order and is respectfully requested.

Respectfully requested,



Robert L. Troike

Reg. No. 24183

Tel. no. 301 751-0825